arXiv:1610.01870v1 [math.DS] 6 Oct 2016

Hausdorff Dimension of Non-Diophantine Points in Finite-Volume Quotients of Rank One Semisimple Lie Groups

Cheng Zheng

Abstract

In this note, we give a definition of Diophantine points of type γ for $\gamma \geq 0$ in a homogeneous space G/Γ and we compute Hausdorff dimensions of subsets of points which are not Diophantine of type γ when G is a semisimple Lie group of real rank one. As a corollary, we will give a description of Hausdorff dimensions of non-Diophantine points of various types in Heisenberg groups, which could be considered as a Jarnik-Besicovitch Theorem on Diophantine approximation in Heisenberg groups.

1 Introduction

The Diophantine approximation of numbers is a well-developed subject. One of the classical theorems in this subject is Jarnik-Besicovitch Theorem, which gives a formula for the Hausdorff dimensions of Diophantine numbers of different orders. Later, this theorem is generalized by Dodson [D92], which describes Hausdorff dimensions of Diophantine matrices of different orders.

It turns out that numbers and matrices with Diophantine conditions are closely related to points in homogeneous spaces with excursion rates under semisimple flows. A detailed description of this connection could be found in [K01]. For example, by reformulation, Dodson's work in [D92] actually gives a formula for Hausdorff dimensions of points with different excursion rates under the semisimple flow $a_t = \mathrm{diag}(e^{t/m}, \ldots, e^{t/m}, e^{-t/n}, \ldots, e^{-t/n})$ on $\mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{Z})$. Also Melián and Pestana [MP93] get a formula for Hausdorff dimensions of points with different geodesic excursion

rates in a hyperbolic manifold. As a consequence, their result implies a generalized version of Jarnik-Besicovitch Theorem on Diophantine approximation by numbers in some number fields of degree 2. In [D85], Dani associates badly approximable $m \times n$ matrices with bounded orbits under $a_t = \mathrm{diag}(e^{t/m}, \ldots, e^{t/m}, e^{-t/n}, \ldots, e^{-t/n})$ on $\mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{Z})$ and shows that the subset of points with bounded orbits under this flow has full Hausdorff dimension. In this direction, Dani [D86] also shows that such result holds for a non-quasiunipotent flow on G/Γ where G is a semisimple Lie group of rank one and Γ is a lattice in G. Finally in [KM96], Kleinbock and Margulis give a complete proof of this result for a non-quasiunipotent flow on any homogeneous space.

Moreover, this topic has also been developed in the case of negatively curved manifolds. For example, in [HP01], they define a Diophantine condition for geodesics starting from a point p and exponentially acculmulating at another point q. Then they get a sharp estimate on Hausdorff dimensions of such Diophantine geodesics. Later in [HP04] they study Diophantine geodesic lines starting from a cusp $p = \infty$ and obtain a Kintchine-Sullivan-type theorem about such Diophantine geodesics. Readers may also refer to [HP02A] and [HP02B] for more details.

In this note, we will consider a similar question in the homogeneous space G/Γ where G is a semisimple Lie group of rank one and Γ is a non-uniform lattice in G. Let $\{a_t\}$ denote a semisimple flow (i.e., every element in $\{a_t\}$ is Ad-semisimple) on the homogeneous space G/Γ. We will define Diophantine points in G/Γ and obtain a formula similar to Jarnik-Besicovitch Theorem. In the last two sections, we will see that the Diophantine condition defined in this paper is equivalent to that in the hyperbolic case [MP93] and that in the complex hyperbolic case in [HP02B].

Before stating the main theorem, we need some notations. For any $p \in G/\Gamma$, we will denote by $\mathrm{Stab}(p)$ the stabilizer of p in G. If $p = g\Gamma$, then $\mathrm{Stab}(p) = g\Gamma g^{-1}$ is a lattice conjugate to Γ. We will fix a norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G and denote by $d(\cdot,\cdot)_G$ and $d(\cdot,\cdot)_{G/\Gamma}$ the induced distances on G and G/Γ respectively. We will denote by $\mathfrak{a}$ the Lie algebra of the one parameter subgroup $\{a_t\}$.

For the semisimple Lie group G of rank one, we can write the Cartan decomposition with respect to a Cartan involution θ by

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$$

where $\mathfrak{k}$ and $\mathfrak{p}$ are the 1-eigenspace and (-1)-eigenspace of θ respectively,

and we may assume that $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ is a maximal abelian subalgebra of $\mathfrak{p}$. Let K be the maximal compact subgroup with the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$. We write the root space decompostion of $\mathfrak{g}$ with respect to the adjoint action of $\{a_t\}$ as

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}.$$

Here α is a simple root and we will think of this simple root as a positive number via the identification

$$\mathfrak{a}^* \cong \mathbb{R}.$$

In other words, $\alpha > 0$ and we have

$$\mathrm{Ad}a_t(v) = e^{\alpha t} v \quad (\forall v \in \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}), \qquad \mathrm{Ad}a_t(v) = e^{2\alpha t} v \quad (\forall v \in \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha})$$

$$\mathrm{Ad}a_t(v) = e^{-\alpha t} v \quad (\forall v \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}), \qquad \mathrm{Ad}a_t(v) = e^{-2\alpha t} v \quad (\forall v \in \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}).$$

Note that the root spaces $\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}$ may be empty.

Definition 1.1. For any $p \in G/\Gamma$, we define the injectivity radius at p by

$$\eta(p) = \inf_{v \in \mathrm{Stab}(p) \setminus \{e\}} d(v, e)_G.$$

Definition 1.2. A point $p \in G/\Gamma$ is Diophantine of type γ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\eta(a_t p) \geq C e^{-\gamma t} \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

We will denote by S_γ the subset of all Diophantine points of type γ in G/Γ, and by S_γ^c the complement of S_γ in G/Γ.

Remark 1.1. Note that by [D86] and [KM96], the subset S_0 has full Hausdorff dimension.

Now we can state the main theorem in this paper.

Theorem 1.1 (Main Theorem)**.** *If $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$, then the Hausdorff dimension of S_γ^c $(0 \leq \gamma < \alpha)$ is*

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_0 + \frac{\alpha - \gamma}{\alpha} \dim g_{\alpha}.$$

If $g_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$, then the Hausdorff dimension of S_γ^c $(0 \leq \gamma < 2\alpha)$ is

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_0 + \frac{4\alpha - \gamma}{4\alpha} \dim g_{\alpha} + \frac{2\alpha - \gamma}{2\alpha} \dim g_{2\alpha}.$$

Remark 1.2. We will see in the last section that the definition of S^c_γ is equivalent to the Diophantine condition in [MP93], and Theorem 1.1 generalizes Theorem 1 in [MP93].

Here we obtain an exact formula for the Hausdorff dimension of S^c_γ which, to the best of the author's knowledge, was only known in the case of hyperbolic manifold, i.e. $G = SO(n, 1)$ (e.g. [MP93]). Also, our proof is based on the theories of Lie groups and dynamical systems. So this note would be a new proof in the hyperbolic case. (See the last section for more details.)

The following theorem is a refined version of Theorem 1.1. First we need some notations. Let $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k$ be the inequivalent cusps of G/Γ, and we fix sufficiently small neighborhoods Y_i of ξ_i in G/Γ $(1 \le i \le k)$ such that these Y_i's are pairwise disjoint.

Definition 1.3. A point $p \in G/\Gamma$ is Diophantine of type $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k)$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and any $t > 0$, we have

$$\eta(a_t p)\chi_{Y_i}(a_t p) \ge Ce^{-\gamma_i t}\chi_{Y_i}(a_t p).$$

We will denote by $S_{\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_k}$ the subset of Diophantine points of type $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k)$, and by $S^c_{\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_k}$ the complement of $S_{\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_k}$ in G/Γ.

Remark 1.3. This definition measures different excursion rates γ_i of the orbit $\{a_t p\}$ near the cusps ξ_i $(1 \le i \le k)$.

Theorem 1.2. *If $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$, then the Hausdorff dimension of $S^c_{\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_k}$ $(0 \le \gamma_i < \alpha, 1 \le i \le k)$ is*

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_0 + \frac{\alpha - \min_{1\le i\le k} \gamma_i}{\alpha} \dim g_\alpha.$$

If $g_{2\alpha} \ne \emptyset$, then the Hausdorff dimension of $S^c_{\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_k}$ $(0 \le \gamma_i < \alpha, 1 \le i \le k)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha} &+ \dim \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_0 \\ &+ \frac{4\alpha - \min_{1\le i\le k} \gamma_i}{4\alpha} \dim g_\alpha + \frac{2\alpha - \min_{1\le i\le k} \gamma_i}{2\alpha} \dim g_{2\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.4. We will show in the last section that Theorem 1.2 generalizes Theorem 7.1 in [Z16].

Under the setting of [HP02B], we will consider the subsets of points which are not Diophantine of type γ for various γ's in Heisenberg groups. As a corollary of Theorem 1.1 and its proof, we will give a description of Hausdorff dimensions of such subsets, which could be considered as a Jarnik-Besicovitch Theorem on Diophantine approximation in Heisenberg groups. We will follow the definitions and notations in [HP02B], which readers may refer to for more details.

The real Heisenberg group $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ is the manifold $\mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ with the group multiplication given by

$$(\zeta, v)(\zeta', v') = \left(\zeta + \zeta', v + v' + 2\Im\left(\zeta \cdot \overline{\zeta'}\right)\right)$$

where $\zeta, \zeta' \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ and $v, v' \in \mathbb{R}$. We write $d_{\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})}$ for the right-invariant distance on $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$. $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ is the $\mathbb{R}$-points of a connected algebraic group $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ with $\mathbb{Q}$-points $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}[i]^{n-1} \times \mathbb{Q}$. For any $r \in \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$, the height $h(r)$ of r is defined as the absolute value of the least common multiple of the denominators of the rationals in the components of r. Let $|\cdot| : \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$|(\zeta, v)| = \left(|\zeta|^4 + v^2\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}$$

and the Cygan distance on $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ is defined by

$$d_{\mathrm{Cyg}}((\zeta, v), (\zeta' v')) = |(\zeta, v)(\zeta', v')^{-1}|.$$

Note that this distance is invariant under the right multilplication of $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$. See [G99] and [HP02B] for more details.

Definition 1.4. A point $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ is Diophantine of type γ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$d_{\mathrm{Cyg}}(\alpha, r) \geq \frac{C}{(h(r))^{\gamma}}$$

for any $r \in \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$. We will denote by L_γ the subset of all Diophantine points of type γ in $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ and by L_γ^c the complement of L^γ in $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$.

Remark 1.5. Note that by Theorem 3.4 in [HP02B], we have $\gamma \geq 1$.

Theorem 1.3. *The Hausdorff dimension of L_γ^c ($\gamma \geq 1$) with respect to the right invariant distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})}$ is equal to*

$$\frac{\gamma + 1}{\gamma} n - 1.$$

Remark 1.6. Note that Hersonsky and Paulin give a Kintchine-Sullivan type theorem on Diophantine Approximation in Heisenberg groups with respect to the Cygan distance d_{Cyg} and its induced Cygan measure μ_{Cyg} (see Theorem 3.5 in [HP02B]). Here Theorem 1.3 can be thought of as a Jarnik-Besicovitch theorem in this setting, but with respect to the right invariant distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})}$ which is different from the Cygan distance.

In the proof of Theorem 1.1, the counting problem (see section 5) will be crucial which involves the mixing property of $\{a_t\}$ acting on G/Γ. Actually it will play an important role in calculating both the upper bound and the lower bound of the Hausdorff dimension. In section 2, we will list concepts and theorems needed in this paper. In section 3, we will reduce Theorem 1.1 (see Theorem 3.1). In section 4, we will give some Lie group facts which will be used often throughout this note. In section 5, we will give a definition of rational points in G/Γ and define the denominator of a rational point. With the help of the mixing property of $\{a_t\}$, we will be able to count the rational points with the denominators between two large numbers. This counting result will be used to calculate the Hausdorff dimension of a tree-like subset. In section 6, we will closely study the meaning of a point in G/Γ being Diophantine and give sufficient condition and necessary condition for it. Combining all the results in this paper, we will give the proof of Theorem 1.1 in section 7. The necessary condition in section 6 will be used for the upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension and the sufficient condition will be used for the lower bound. In section 8 and section 9, we will prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. In the last section, we will discuss the relation between Theorem 1.1 and [MP93], and also the relation between Theorem 1.2 and [Z16].

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank my advisor Nimish Shah for his encouragements and helps during my PhD study. Many ideas in this note come from discussions with him.

2 Notations and Preliminaries

We will denote by $B_1 \ll B_2$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $B_1 \leq CB_2$. If $B_1 \ll B_2$ and $B_2 \ll B_1$, we will write $B_1 \sim B_2$. We will specify the constant in the contexts.

Let exp be the exponential map from $\mathfrak{g}$ to G. For any Lie subgroup

$H \subseteq G$, we will denote by $\mathrm{Lie}(H)$ the Lie subalgebra of H and μ_H the Haar measure on H.

Let

$$\mathfrak{n}_+ = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}, \quad \mathfrak{n}_- = \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}$$

and N_+ and N_- be the corresponding unipotent subgroups. We will denote by $A = \{a_t\}$ and

$$A_{s_1,s_2} = \{a_t \in A : s_1 \leq t \leq s_2\}$$

and

$$N_+(S) = \{n \in N_+ : n \in S\} \quad N_-(S) = \{n \in N_- : n \in S\}$$

for any subset $S \subset N_+$ or N_-. We will fix an orthonormal basis $\{f_1, f_2 \dots\}$ in $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and write

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{g}_\alpha}(r) = \left\{ \sum_i x_i f_i \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha : |x_i| < r \right\}$$

for the open cube around 0 of equal side length $2r$ in $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$. Similarly we could define the open cube $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}}(r)$ centered at 0 of equal side length $2r$ in $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}$.

If $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$, we have that $\mathfrak{n}_+ = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{n}_- = \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$. We will denote by

$$B_{N_+}(r) = \exp(\mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{g}_\alpha}(r))$$

the open cube centered at e with side length r in N_+. If $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$, then $\mathfrak{n}_+ = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}$ and we will denote by

$$B_{N_+}(r_1, r_2) = \exp(\mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{g}_\alpha}(r_1) + \mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}}(r_2))$$

for the open box centered at e with length r_1 in $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$-direction and r_2 in $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}$-direction.

The Bruhat decomposition in the real rank one case has the following simple form

$$G = MAN_- \cup MAN_- \omega MAN_-$$

where M is the centralizer of $\mathfrak{a}$ in K and ω is a representative of the non-trivial element in the Weyl group.

We need the following theorem about Hausdorff dimension. Before stating the theorem, we need some notations. Readers may refer to [KM96]. Let X be a Riemannian manifold, m a volume form and E a compact subset of X. We will denote the diameter of a set S by $\mathrm{diam}(S)$ and the Hausdorff dimension by $\dim_H S$.

A countable collection $\mathcal{A}$ of compact subsets of E is said to be tree-like if $\mathcal{A}$ is the union of finite subcollections $\mathcal{A}_j$ such that

1. $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{E\}$.
2. For any j and $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{A}_j$, either $S_1 = S_2$ or $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$.
3. For any j and $S_1 \in \mathcal{A}_{j+1}$, there exists $S_2 \in \mathcal{A}_j$ such that $S_1 \subset S_2$.
4. $d_j(\mathcal{A}) := \sup_{S \in \mathcal{A}_j} \operatorname{diam}(S) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$.

We write $\mathbf{A}_j = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_j} A$ and define $\mathbf{A}_\infty = \bigcap_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{A}_j$. Moreover, we define

$$\Delta_j(\mathcal{A}) = \inf_{S \in \mathcal{A}_j} \frac{m(\mathbf{A}_{j+1} \cap S)}{m(S)}.$$

The following theorem gives a way to estimate the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathbf{A}_\infty$.

Theorem 2.1 ([M87], [U91] or [KM96]). *Let (X, m) be a Riemannian manifold. Assume that there exist constants $D > 0$ and $k > 0$ such that*

$$m(B(x, r)) \leq Dr^k$$

for any $x \in X$ and any ball $B(x, r)$ of radius r around x. Then for any tree-like collection $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of E

$$\dim_H(\mathbf{A}_\infty) \geq k - \limsup_{j \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{j} \log(\frac{1}{\Delta_i(\mathcal{A})})}{\log(\frac{1}{d_{j+1}(\mathcal{A})})}$$

We also need the following theorem about the fundamental domain of a non-uniform lattice in G of real rank one. We write the Siegel set

$$\Omega(s, V) = KA_{s,\infty}N_-(V)$$

for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and some compact subset $V \subset N_-$.

Theorem 2.2 ([GR70], [D84]). *There exist $s_0 > 0$, a compact subset V_0 of N and a finite subset Σ of G such that the following assertions hold:*

1. *$G = \Omega(s_0, V_0)\Sigma\Gamma$.*
2. *For all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $\Gamma \cap \sigma^{-1}N_-\sigma$ is a cocompact lattice in $\sigma^{-1}N_-\sigma$.*

3. *For all compact subsets V of N the set*

$$\{\gamma \in \Gamma | \Omega(s_0, V)\Sigma\gamma \cap \Omega(s_0, V) \neq \emptyset\}$$

is finite.

4. *Give a compact subset V of N containing V_0, there exists $s_1 \in (0, s_0)$ such that whenever $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma$ are such that $\Omega(s_0, V)\sigma\gamma \cap \Omega(s_1, V)\tau$ is non-empty for some γ then $\sigma = \tau$ and $\sigma\gamma\sigma^{-1} \in (K \cap Z) \cdot N_- \subset P$.*

Here Z is the centralizer of $A = \{a_t\}$ and $P = ZN_-$.

Remark 2.1. Note that the subset Σ corresponds to the cusp set $\{\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_k\}$.

3 Reductions

By the property of Hausdorff dimension, to prove Theorem 1.1, it suffices to prove that for any point $x = g\Gamma$ and any small open neighborhood $B_G(r)x \subset G/\Gamma$ of $x = g\Gamma$ with a sufficiently small $r < \eta(x)$, the subset $S_\gamma^c \cap B_G(r)x$ has the same Hausdorff dimension as that in the main theorem. Furthermore, for any element g in $B_G(r)$, we can write

$$g = n_- a n_+$$

for some $n_- \in N_-$, $a \in A$ and $n_+ \in N_+$. By definition, $g \in S_\gamma$ if and only if $n_+ \in S_\gamma$, and hence it is enough to prove that for any small open ball U_0 at e in N_+ we have

$$\dim_H S_\gamma^c \cap U_0 x = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha-\gamma}{\alpha} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha & \text{if } g_{2\alpha} = \emptyset \\ \frac{4\alpha-\gamma}{4\alpha} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + \frac{2\alpha-\gamma}{2\alpha} \dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} & \text{if } \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset \end{cases}.$$

Replacing the lattice Γ by $g\Gamma g^{-1}$, we can assume without loss of generality that $x = e\Gamma$ and hence to prove the main theorem, it suffices to prove the following

Theorem 3.1. *Let U_0 be a small open ball at e in N_+ of radius $r < \eta(e\Gamma)$. Then we have*

$$\dim_H S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha-\gamma}{\alpha} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha & \text{if } \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset \\ \frac{4\alpha-\gamma}{4\alpha} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + \frac{2\alpha-\gamma}{2\alpha} \dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} & \text{if } g_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset \end{cases}.$$

Here $0 \leq \gamma < \alpha$ if $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$ and $0 \leq \gamma < 2\alpha$ if $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$.

In the following sections, we will fix this open ball $U_0 \subset N_+$ and study the problem of Diophantine points in the space $U_0(e\Gamma)$ instead of G/Γ. Since U_0 is isomorphic to $U_0(e\Gamma)$, we will still write μ_{N_+} for the N_+-invariant measure on $U_0(e\Gamma)$, i.e.

$$\mu_{N_+}(B(e\Gamma)) = \mu_{N_+}(B)$$

for any Borel subset $B \subset U_0 \subset N_+$, and for any point $n_+ \in U_0$, the subset $B_{N_+}(r)n_+\Gamma$ or $B_{N_+}(r_1, r_2)n_+\Gamma$ will be an open box at $n_+\Gamma \in U_0(e\Gamma)$. In other words, we will use the notations in U_0 and $U_0(e\Gamma)$ interchangeably.

4 Some Lie Group Facts

In this section, we will prove some Lie group facts which will be used often in this note.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $g \in G$ be such that $Adg(N_-) \cap N_- \neq \{e\}$. Then we have $g \in MAN_-$.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence from the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [BZ16]. □

Proposition 4.2. *For any $u \in \mathfrak{n}_- \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \mathfrak{n}_+ \setminus \{0\}$ we have*

$$\|[u, v]\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \sim \|u\|_{\mathfrak{g}}\|v\|_{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

Here the implicit constant depends only on G.

Proof. It suffices to prove that for any $u \in \mathfrak{n}_- \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \mathfrak{n}_+ \setminus \{0\}$

$$[u, v] \neq 0$$

and this follows immediately from Proposition 4.1. □

Proposition 4.3. *Let $u \in G$ be a unipotent element. Then there exists a unique element n in $N_+ \cup \{w\}$ such that $Adn(u) \in N_-$. Moreover, if $u \notin N_+$, then this $n \in N_+$.*

Proof. We know that there is an element $g \in G$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}g(u) \in N_-$. By the Bruhat decomposition, g is either $ma\bar{n}\omega$ or $ma\bar{n}n$ for some $m \in M, a \in A, n \in N_+$ and $\bar{n} \in N_-$. Since $ma\bar{n}$ stablizes N_-, we have either $\mathrm{Ad}\omega(u) \in N_-$ or $\mathrm{Ad}n(u) \in N_-$.

Suppose that there are two elements $n_1, n_2 \in N_+ \cup \{w\}$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}n_i(u) \in N_-$. Then $\mathrm{Ad}n_2 n_1^{-1} N_- \cap N_- \neq \{0\}$. By Proposition 4.1, this implies that $n_2 n_1^{-1} \in MAN_-$ and hence by the Bruhat decomposition, $n_2 n_1^{-1} = e$ and $n_1 = n_2$. The second part follows immediately from the first. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$. Then for any $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we have $\sigma\Gamma\sigma^{-1} \cap \exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha})$ is a lattice in $\exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha})$.*

Proof. Let $u \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \setminus \{0\}$. By Lemma 7.73 (a) in [K02], we know that the map

$$ad(u) : \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \to \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}$$

is surjective and hence

$$[\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}, \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}] = \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}.$$

This implies that

$$[N_-, N_-] = \exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}).$$

On the other hand, since $\sigma\Gamma\sigma^{-1} \cap N_-$ is a lattice in N_-, by Corollary 1 of Theorem 2.3 in [R72], we know that $\sigma\Gamma\sigma^{-1} \cap [N_-, N_-]$ is a lattice in $[N_-, N_-]$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

5 Counting Rational Points

In this section, we will define rational points in G/Γ and their denominators. Then we will count rational points, which will be crucial to the study of Diophantine points in the following sections.

Definition 5.1. A point $p \in G/\Gamma$ is called rational if $\mathrm{Stab}(p) \cap N_- \neq \{e\}$.

Note that if p is rational, then $\eta(a_t p) \to 0$ and $\{a_t p\}$ diverges as $t \to \infty$. By Corollary 6.2 in [D85], we immediately get the following

Proposition 5.1 (Corollary 6.2 [D85])**.** *$p \in G/\Gamma$ is rational if and only if $p \in \bigcup_{\sigma\in\Sigma} MAN_-\sigma\Gamma$.*

Definition 5.2. A point p is called σ-rational for some $\sigma \in \Sigma$ if $p \in MAN_-\sigma\Gamma$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $p \in G/\Gamma$ be σ-rational and suppose that $p = m_1 a_1 n_1 \sigma\Gamma = m_2 a_2 n_2 \sigma\Gamma$. Then $a_1 = a_2$.*

Proof. Since $m_1a_1n_1\sigma\Gamma = m_2a_2n_2\sigma\Gamma$, the lattices of N_-

$$m_1a_1n_1\sigma\Gamma\sigma^{-1}n_1^{-1}a_1^{-1}m_1^{-1} \cap N_-, \quad m_2a_2n_2\sigma\Gamma\sigma^{-1}n_2^{-1}a_2^{-1}m_2^{-1} \cap N_-$$

coincide and hence they have the same co-volume in N. This implies that $a_1 = a_2$. □

Definition 5.3. We define the σ-denominator of a σ-rational point $p \in G/\Gamma$ by

$$d_\sigma(p) = e^{-\alpha t_0}$$

where $p = ma_{t_0}n\sigma\Gamma$ for some $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 5.1. Note that by Proposition 5.2, this definition is well-defined.

Definition 5.4. For any $U \subset N_+$, we will denote by $S_\sigma(U(e\Gamma), l_1, l_2)$ the subset of σ-rational points in $U(e\Gamma)$ whose σ-denominators are between l_1 and l_2.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$. Then for any open subset $U \subset U_0 \subset N_+$, we have that $S_\sigma(U(e\Gamma), C, C/2)$ is finite and*

$$|S_\sigma(U(e\Gamma), C/2, C)| \sim \mu_{N_+}(U)C^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha}$$

for any sufficiently large $C > 0$. Here the implicit constant depends only on G and Γ.

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$, we have that $\mathfrak{n}_+ = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{n}_- = \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$. Recall that $B_{N_+}(r)$ denotes the open box centered at e with length r in N_+.

Let $n_+\Gamma \in N_+\Gamma$ be a σ-rational point and there exist $m \in M, a_{t_0} \in A$ and $n \in N_-$ such that $n_+\Gamma = ma_{t_0}n\sigma\Gamma$. By definition, the σ-denominator of $n_+\Gamma$ being between $C/2$ and C is equivalent to the condition that

$$C/2 \leq e^{-\alpha t_0} \leq C.$$

This implies that $a_{\ln C/\alpha}n\Gamma \in MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma$.

Since $MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma$ is compact, we can find $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\delta < \eta(y)$$

for any $y \in MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N_\Omega\sigma\Gamma$. Now by thickening the subset $MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N_\Omega\sigma\Gamma$ along the N_+ direction, we would like to study the following integral

$$\int_U \chi_{B_{N_+}(\delta)MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma}(a_{\ln C/\alpha}n\Gamma)d\mu_{N_+}(n). \tag{1}$$

On the one hand, by the mixing property of the action a_t, integral (1) is asymptotically equal to

$$\mu_{N_+}(U)\int_{G/\Gamma}\chi_{B_{N_+}(\delta)MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma}(g)d\mu_G(g)\sim\mu_{N_+}(U)\delta^{\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha}. \qquad (2)$$

On the other hand, if $n_q\Gamma$ is a σ-rational point in $U(e\Gamma)$, then any $n\Gamma\in B_{N_+}(\delta/C)n_q\Gamma$ satisfies the following

$$a_{\ln C/\alpha}n\Gamma\in B_{N_+}(\delta)MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma.$$

Conversely, if a point $n\Gamma\in U(e\Gamma)$ satisfies

$$a_{\ln C/\alpha}n\Gamma\in B_{N_+}(\delta)MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N_\Omega\sigma\Gamma,$$

then there is a point $n_q\Gamma$ with

$$n_q\Gamma\in B_{N_+}(\delta/C)n\Gamma$$

such that

$$a_{\ln C/\alpha}n_q\Gamma\in MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma$$

which means that n_q is a σ-rational point. This implies that integral (1) is also asymptotically equal to

$$|S_\sigma(U,C/2,C)|(\delta/C)^{\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha}. \qquad (3)$$

Hence, by comparing equations (2) and (3), we know that

$$|S_\sigma(U,C/2,C)|\sim\mu_{N_+}(U)\delta^{\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha}/(\delta/C)^{\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha}=\mu_{N_+}(U)C^{\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha}.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition □

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}\neq 0$. Then for any open subset $U\subset U_0\subset N_+$, we have that $S_\sigma(U(e\Gamma),C/2,C)$ is finite and*

$$|S_\sigma(U(e\Gamma),C/2,C)|\sim\mu(U)C^{\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha+2\dim\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}}$$

for any sufficiently large $C>0$. Here the implicit constant depends only on G and Γ.

Proof. In this case, the proof is almost identical to that in the case of $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = 0$ but computations involved will be more complicated. Recall that $B_{N_+}(r_1, r_2)$ denotes the open box centered at e with length r_1 in $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$-direction and r_2 in $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}$-direction.

Let $n\Gamma \in N_+\Gamma$ be σ-rational and there exist $m \in M$, $a_{t_0} \in A$ and $n \in N_-$ such that $n\Gamma = ma_{t_0}\bar{n}\sigma\Gamma$. The σ-denominator of $n\Gamma$ being between $C/2$ and C is equivalent to the condition that

$$C/2 \leq e^{-\alpha t_0} \leq C.$$

This implies that $a_{\ln C/\alpha} n\Gamma \in MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma$.

Since $MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma$ is compact, we can find $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\delta < \eta(y)$$

for any $y \in MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma$. Now by thickening the subset $MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma$ along the N_+ direction, we would like to study the following integral

$$\int_U \chi_{B_{N_+}(\delta,\delta)MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma}(a_{\ln C/\alpha} n\Gamma)dn. \tag{4}$$

On the one hand, by the mixing property of the action a_t, integral (4) is asymptotically equal to

$$\mu_{N_+}(U)\int_{G/\Gamma} \chi_{B_{N_+}(\delta,\delta)MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma}(g)dg \sim \mu_{N_+}(U)\delta^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + \dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}}. \tag{5}$$

On the other hand, if $n_q\Gamma$ is a σ-rational point in $U(e\Gamma)$, then any $n\Gamma \in B_{N_+}(\delta/C, \delta/C^2)n_q\Gamma$ satisfies the following

$$a_{\ln C/\alpha} n\Gamma \in B_{N_+}(\delta,\delta)MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma.$$

Conversely, if a point $n\Gamma \in U(e\Gamma)$ satisfies

$$a_{\ln C/\alpha} n\Gamma \in B_{N_+}(\delta,\delta)MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma,$$

then there is a point $n_q\Gamma$ with

$$n\Gamma \in B_{N_+}(\delta/C, \delta/C^2)n_q\Gamma$$

such that

$$a_{\ln C/\alpha} n_q\Gamma \in MA_{-\ln 2/\alpha,0}N(\Omega)\sigma\Gamma$$

which means that $n_q\Gamma$ is a σ-rational point. This implies that integral (4) is also asymptotically equal to

$$|S_\sigma(U, C/2, C)|(\delta/C)^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha}(\delta/C^2)^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}}. \tag{6}$$

Hence, by comparing equations (5) and (6), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |S_\sigma(U, C/2, C)| &\sim \mu_{N_+}(U)\delta^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + \dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}}/(\delta/C)^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha}(\delta/C^2)^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}} \\ &= \mu_{N_+}(U)C^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + 2\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the proposition □

Definition 5.5. We define the denominator of a rational point p by

$$d(p) = \inf_{v \in \mathrm{Stab}(p) \cap \exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-\beta}) \setminus \{e\}} \|v\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}$$

where $\beta = \alpha$ if $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$ and $\beta = 2\alpha$ if $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$.

Remark 5.2. Note that by Proposition 4.4, $\mathrm{Stab}(p) \cap \exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}) \neq \{e\}$ is a lattice in $\exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha})$ if $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$ and so $d(p)$ is well-defined.

Definition 5.6. For any $U \subset N_+$, we will denote by $S(U(e\Gamma), l_1, l_2)$ the subset in $U(e\Gamma)$ of rational points whose denominators are between l_1 and l_2.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $p \in G/\Gamma$ be a rational point. Then*

$$d(p) \sim d_\sigma(p)$$

whenever p is a σ-rational point for some $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Here the implicit constant depends only on G and Γ.

Proof. Let $p = ma_{t_0}n\sigma\Gamma$ for some $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$. Then

$$\mathrm{Stab}(p) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} = a_{t_0}(\mathrm{Stab}(mn\sigma\Gamma) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha})a_{t_0}^{-1}.$$

Since m, n, σ are all in compact subsets in G, this implies that

$$d(p) \sim e^{-\alpha t_0} = d_\sigma(p).$$

The proof in the case $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$ is similar. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 5.6. *Let $U \subset U_0 \subset N_+$ be an open box in N_+. For any sufficiently large $C > 0$ we have that $S_\sigma(U(e\Gamma), C/2, C)$ is finite and*

1. *if $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$, then*

$$|S(U(e\Gamma), C/2, C)| \sim \mu_{N_+}(U) C^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha}.$$

2. *if $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$, then*

$$|S(U(e\Gamma), C/2, C)| \sim \mu_{N_+}(U) C^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + 2 \dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}}.$$

Here the implicit constants depend only on G and Γ.

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 5.1, Proposition 5.3, Proposition 5.4 and Proposition 5.5. □

6 Diophantine Points

In this section, we will study the Diophantine points and prove some propositions which will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $p \in G/\Gamma$ be a non-rational point. If p is not Diophantine of type γ, then there exists a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ satisfing the following conditions*

1. *for each $t_n > 0$, there is a $v_n \in Stab(a_{t_n} p)$ such that v_n is unipotent and $d(v_n, e)_G = C_p e^{-\gamma t_n}$ for some constant $C_p > 0$ depending only on p*

2. *for each $t_n > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_n > 0$ such that for any $t \in (0, \epsilon_n)$, we have*

$$d(Ad(a_{-t}) v_n, e)_G > C_p e^{-\gamma(t_n - t)}.$$

Proof. By definition, we know that if p is not Diophantine of type γ, then there exist a constant $C_p > 0$ and a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ such that

$$\eta(a_{t_n} p) = C_p e^{-\gamma t_n}$$

and for each $t_n > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_n > 0$ such that for any $t \in (0, \epsilon_n)$ we have

$$\eta(a_{t_n - t} p) > C_p e^{-\gamma(t_n - t)}.$$

This implies that there exists $v_n \in \mathrm{Stab}(a_{t_n}p)$ such that

$$d(v_n, e)_G = C_p e^{-\gamma t_n}, \quad d(Ad(a_{-t})v_n, e)_G > C_p e^{-\gamma(t_n - t)} (\forall t \in (0, \epsilon_n)).$$

It follows from Corollary 11.18 in [R72] that v_n is unipotent for sufficiently large $t_n > 0$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$. Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma) \subset G/\Gamma$ be non-rational, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ a sufficiently large number and $v_0 \in Stab(a_{t_0}p)$ such that t_0 and v_0 satisfy condition 1 and condition 2 in Proposition 6.1. Then there is a rational point $q \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ with $d(q) \sim e^{(\alpha-\gamma)t_0}$ (the implicit constant depending only on p) such that*

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on p and G.

Proof. Since $\{a_{t_0}\}$ expands N_+, condition 2 in Proposition 6.1 implies that $v_0 \notin N_+$. Let $v_0 = \exp(v)$ for some $v \in \mathfrak{g}$. By Proposition 4.3, there is a unique $n \in N_+$ such that

$$\mathrm{Ad}n(v) = z \in \mathfrak{n}_-.$$

Now set $n^{-1} = \exp(u)$ for some $u \in \mathfrak{n}_+$. Then we have

$$z + [u, z] + [u, [u, z]]/2 = v$$

$$z \in \mathfrak{n}_-, \quad [u, z] \in \mathfrak{g}_0, \quad [u, [u, z]] \in \mathfrak{n}_+.$$

Since $\|v\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \sim d(v_0, e)_G = C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}$ for some C_p as in Proposition 6.1, by condition 1 and condition 2 in Proposition 6.1, we have

$$\|z\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \sim C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}, \quad \|[u, z]\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \leq C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}.$$

By Proposition 4.2, this implies that

$$\|u\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \leq C_1$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$ depending only on G, and hence u and n are bounded.

Now by definition, we know that $na_{t_0}p$ is rational and hence $a_{-t_0}na_{t_0}p$ is rational. Let $q = (a_{-t_0}na_{t_0})p$ and we have that

$$d(a_{-t_0}na_{t_0}, e)_G \leq \|a_{-t_0}ua_{t_0}\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \ll e^{-\alpha t_0}.$$

Also since n is bounded we have that

$$d(na_{t_0}p) \sim C_p e^{-\gamma t_0},$$

and hence the denominator of $q = a_{-t_0}na_{t_0}p$ is equal to

$$d(q) = e^{\alpha t_0} d(na_{t_0}p) \sim C_p e^{(\alpha-\gamma)t_0}$$

and hence

$$d(a_{-t_0}na_{t_0}, e)_G \leq Cd(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Note that C depends only on p and G. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 6.3. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$. Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma) \subset G/\Gamma$ be a non-rational point. If p is not Diophantine of type γ, then there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence of distinct rational points $q_n \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ with $d(q_n) \to \infty$ such that*

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q_n.$$

Proof. Suppose that $p \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ is not Diophantine of type γ. By Proposition 6.1, there exist infinitely many $t_n \to \infty$ and $v_n \in \mathrm{Stab}(a_{t_n}p)$ satisfying the conditions in Proposition 6.1 and hence by Proposition 6.2, there exist infinitely many rational points $q_n \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ with $d(q_n) \sim e^{(\alpha-\gamma)t_n}$ such that

$$p \in B(Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q_n$$

for some constant C depending only on p and G. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 6.4. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$. Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ and let $\epsilon > 0$ be a sufficiently small number. If there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence $q_n \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ of distinct rational points with $d(q_n) \to \infty$ such that*

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q_n,$$

then p is not Diophantine of type γ.

Proof. Suppose that there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence $q_n \in G/\Gamma$ of rational points converging to p such that

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q_n.$$

Let $t_n = \ln d(q_n)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}$. Then we have that

$$d(a_{t_n}q_n, a_{t_n}p)_{G/\Gamma} \leq C$$

and

$$\eta(a_{t_n}q_n) \sim d(q_n)/e^{\alpha t_n} = e^{-(\gamma+\epsilon)t_n}.$$

This implies that

$$\eta(a_{t_n}p) \leq C'e^{-(\gamma+\epsilon)t_n}$$

for some constant $C' > 0$ and infinitely many $t_n \to \infty$. Hence by definition p is not Diophantine of type γ. □

Proposition 6.5. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma) \subset G/\Gamma$ be non-rational, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ a sufficiently large number and $v_0 \in Stab(a_{t_0}p)$ such that t_0 and v_0 satisfy condition 1 and condition 2 in Proposition 6.1. Then there exists $n \in N_+$ such that*

$$Adn(v_0) \in \exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}).$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, we write

$$a_{t_0}p = ka_sn\sigma\Gamma$$

for some $k \in K$, $a_s \in A$, $n_0 \in N_-(V_0)$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Since

$$v_0 \in \mathrm{Stab}(a_{t_0}p) = ka_sn_0(\sigma\Gamma\sigma^{-1})n_0^{-1}a_{-s}k^{-1} \text{ and } d(v_0, e)_G = C_pe^{-\gamma t_0}$$

we know that s is a sufficiently large number. Also note that k, n_0 and σ are all in compact subsets and by Proposition 4.4, $\sigma\Gamma\sigma^{-1} \cap \exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha})$ is a lattice in $\exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha})$. Therefore, we have that

$$v_0 \in ka_sn_0(\sigma\Gamma\sigma^{-1} \cap \exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}))n_0^{-1}a_{-s}k^{-1}.$$

In other words, we can find $n \in G$ such that

$$\mathrm{Ad}n(v_0) \in \exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}). \tag{7}$$

By Proposition 4.3 (or repeating the proof of Proposition 4.3), we can assume, without loss of generality, that $n \in N_+ \cup \{w\}$. Since $\{a_t\}$ expands N_+, condition 2 in Proposition 6.1 implies that $v_0 \notin N_+$, and hence by equation (7), we have $n \in N_+$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 6.6. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma) \subset G/\Gamma$ be non-rational, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ a sufficiently large number and $v_0 \in Stab(a_{t_0}p)$ such that t_0 and v_0 satisfy condition 1 and condition 2 in Proposition 6.1. Then there is a rational point $q \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ with $d(q) \sim e^{(2\alpha-\gamma)t_0/2}$ (the implicit constant depending only on p) such that*

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, Cd(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on p and G.

Proof. By Proposition 6.5, we know that there exists $n \in N_+$ such that

$$\mathrm{Ad}(n)(v_0) \in \exp(\mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}).$$

Let $v_0 = \exp(v)$ for some $v \in \mathfrak{g}$. Then we have

$$\mathrm{Ad}n(v) = z \in \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha}.$$

Now set $n^{-1} = \exp(u)$ for some $u = u_1 + u_2 \in \mathfrak{n}_+$ with $u_1 \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and $u_2 \in \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} z &+ [u_1, z] + ([u_2, z] + [u_1, [u_1, z]]/2) \\ &+ ([u_1, [u_1, [u_1, z]]]/6 + [u_1, [u_2, z]]/2 + [u_2, [u_1, z]]/2) + \cdots = v \end{aligned}$$

$$a = [u_1, z] \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}, b = [u_2, z] + [u_1, [u_1, z]]/2 \in \mathfrak{g}_0$$

$$\begin{aligned} c &= [u_1, [u_1, [u_1, z]]]/6 + [u_1, [u_2, z]]/2 + [u_2, [u_1, z]]/2 \\ &= [u_1, [u_1, [u_1, z]]]/6 + [u_2, [u_1, z]] \\ &= [u_1, [u_1, [u_1, z]]]/6 + [u_1, [u_2, z]] \\ &= -[u_1, [u_1, [u_1, z]]]/3 + [u_1, b] \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|v\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \sim d(v_0, e)_G = C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}$, we have

$$\|a\|_{\mathfrak{g}}, \|b\|_{\mathfrak{g}}, \|c\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \ll C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}$$

and by the condition 2 in Proposition 6.1, we have

$$\text{either } \|z\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \sim C_p e^{-\gamma t_0} \text{ or } \|a\|_{\mathfrak{g}} = \|[u_1, z]\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \sim C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}.$$

If $\|z\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \sim C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}$, then we have

$$\|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}}\|z\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \ll \|a\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \leq C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}, \quad \|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \leq C_1$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$ and

$$\|u_2\|_{\mathfrak{g}}\|z\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \ll \|b\|_{\mathfrak{g}} + \|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2\|z\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \ll C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}, \quad \|u_2\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \leq C_2$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$.

If $\|a\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \sim C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}$, then

$$\|a\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \ll \|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}}\|z\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \leq \|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}} C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}, \quad \|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \geq C_3$$

for some constant $C_3 > 0$ and

$$\|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2\|a\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \ll \|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}}\|b\|_{\mathfrak{g}} + \|c\|_{\mathfrak{g}}, \quad \|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \ll 1 + \frac{1}{\|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}}} \leq C_4$$

for some constant $C_4 > 0$ and

$$\|u_2\|_{\mathfrak{g}}\|a\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \ll \|c\|_{\mathfrak{g}} + \|u_1\|_{\mathfrak{g}}^3\|z\|_{\mathfrak{g}}, \quad \|u_2\|_{\mathfrak{g}} \leq C_5$$

for some constant $C_5 > 0$. Either case, we have that u and n are bounded.

Now by definition, we have that $na_{t_0}p$ is rational and hence $a_{-t_0}na_{t_0}p$ is rational. Let $q = (a_{-t_0}na_{t_0})p$ and we have that

$$a_{-t_0}na_{t_0} \in B_{N_+}(C_6 e^{-\alpha t_0}, C_6 e^{-2\alpha t_0})$$

for some constant $C_6 > 0$. By definition we know that

$$d(na_{t_0}p) \sim (C_p e^{-\gamma t_0})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and hence the denominator of $q = a_{-t_0}na_{t_0}p$ is equal to

$$d(q) = e^{\alpha t_0} d(na_{t_0}p) \sim C_p^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{(2\alpha-\gamma)t_0/2}.$$

So we have that

$$a_{-t_0}na_{t_0} \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, Cd(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})$$

for some $C > 0$. Note that C depends only on p and G. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 6.7. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ be a non-rational point. If p is not Diophantine of type γ, then there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence $q_n \in U(e\Gamma)$ of distinct rational points with $d(q_n) \to \infty$ such that*

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q_n.$$

Proof. Suppose that $p \in U(e\Gamma)$ is not Diophantine of type γ. Then there exist infinitely many $t_n \to \infty$ and $v_n \in \mathrm{Stab}(a_{t_n}p)$ satisfying the conditions in Proposition 6.1 and hence by Proposition 6.6, there exist infinitely many rational points $q_n \in U(e\Gamma)$ with $d(q_n) \sim e^{(2\alpha-\gamma)t_n/2}$ such that

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q_n$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on p and G. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 6.8. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ and let $\epsilon > 0$ be a sufficiently small number. If there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence $q_n \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ of distinct rational points with $d(q_n) \to \infty$ such that*

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}, Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q_n,$$

then p is not Diophantine of type γ.

Proof. Suppose that there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence $q_n \in G/\Gamma$ of rational points converging to p such that

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}, Cd(q_n)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q_n.$$

Let $t_n = \ln d(q_n)^{\frac{2}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}$. Then we have that

$$d(a_{t_n}q_n, a_{t_n}p)_{G/\Gamma} \leq C$$

and

$$\eta(a_{t_n}q_n) \sim d(q_n)^2/e^{2\alpha t_n} = e^{-(\gamma+\epsilon)t_n}.$$

This implies that

$$\eta(a_{t_n}p) \leq C'e^{-(\gamma+\epsilon)t_n}$$

for some constant $C' > 0$ and infinitely many $t_n \to \infty$. Hence by definition p is not Diophantine of type γ.

□

7 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Before we prove Theorem 3.1, we need the following propositions.

Proposition 7.1. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$. There exist r_0 and $C_0 > 0$ with the following property: for any rational point $q \in U_0(e\Gamma)$, there exists a large constant $L_q > 0$ such that for any $l > L_q$ the open box $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q$ contains at least $C_0 l^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} \mu_{N_+}(B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q)$ many disjoint sub open boxes $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(\tilde{q})^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})\tilde{q}$ where $\tilde{q}$'s are rational points with denominator between l and $2l$.*

Proof. We fix a sufficiently small $r_0 > 0$. By Proposition 5.6, for the open box $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q$, there exists a large constant $L_q > 0$ such that for $l > L_q$ there are at least $C_0 l^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} \mu_{N_+}(B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q)$ many rational points in $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q$ with denominator between l and $2l$ for some absolute constant $C_0 > 0$. For each such rational point $\tilde{q}$, we construct an open box $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(\tilde{q})^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})\tilde{q}$ around $\tilde{q}$, and to prove the proposition, we only need to prove that these open boxes are disjoint. Let q_1 and q_2 be two such rational points. Suppose that $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q_1)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q_1$ and $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q_2)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q_2$ are not disjoint. Then there exists an element $n \in N_+$ such that

$$nq_1 = q_2 \text{ and } n \in B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q_1)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}} + r_0 d(q_2)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}}).$$

By applying a_{t_0} with $t_0 = \ln(l/r_0)/\alpha$ on both sides, we have

$$(a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}) a_{t_0} q_1 = a_{t_0} q_2 \tag{8}$$

and by calculations, we have that

$$d(a_{t_0} q_1) \sim d(a_{t_0} q_2) \sim r_0 \text{ and } d(a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}, e)_G \ll l^{-\frac{\gamma}{\alpha-\gamma}}.$$

Since r_0 is sufficiently small and $a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}$ is bounded, from the equation (8) we know that there exist nonzero elements $u_1 \in Stab(a_{t_0} q_1) \cap \mathfrak{n}_-$ and $u_2 \in Stab(a_{t_0} q_2) \cap \mathfrak{n}_-$ such that

$$\mathrm{Ad}(a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}) u_1 = u_2$$

and hence

$$\mathrm{Ad}(a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}) \mathfrak{n}_- \cap \mathfrak{n}_- \neq \{0\}.$$

So by Proposition 4.1, we have $a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0} = e$, $n = e$ and $q_1 = q_2$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 7.2. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$. There exist r_0 and $C_0 > 0$ with the following property: for any open box $U(e\Gamma) \subset U_0(e\Gamma)$, there exists a large constant $L > 0$ such that for any $l > L$ the open box $U(e\Gamma)$ contains at least $C_0 l^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + 2\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}} \mu_{N_+}(U)$ many disjoint sub open boxes of the form $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q$ where q's are rational points with denominator between l and $2l$.*

Proof. We fix a sufficiently small $r_0 > 0$. By Proposition 5.6, for any $U(e\Gamma)$, there exists a large constant $L > 0$ such that $l > L$ there are at least $C_0 l^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + 2\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}} \mu_{N_+}(U)$ many rational points in $U(e\Gamma)$ with denominators between l and $2l$ for some absolute constant $C_0 > 0$. For each such rational point q, we construct an open box $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q$ around q, and to prove the proposition, we only need to prove that these open boxes are disjoint. Let q_1 and q_2 be two such rational points. Suppose that $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q_1)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, r_0 d(q_1)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q_1$ and $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q_2)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, r_0 d(q_2)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q_2$ are not disjoint. Then there exists an element $n \in N_+$ such that $nq_1 = q_2$ and

$$n \in B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q_1)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}} + r_0 d(q_2)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, r_0 d(q_1)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}} + r_0 d(q_2)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}} + r_0 d(q_1)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}} r_0 d(q_2)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})$$

By applying a_{t_0} with $t_0 = \ln(l/r_0^{\frac{1}{2}})/\alpha$ on both sides, we have

$$(a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}) a_{t_0} q_1 = a_{t_0} q_2 \tag{9}$$

and by calculations, we have that

$$d(a_{t_0} q_1) \sim d(a_{t_0} q_2) \sim r_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } d(a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}, e)_G \ll l^{-\frac{\gamma}{2\alpha-\gamma}}.$$

Since r_0 is sufficiently small and $a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}$ is bounded, by equation (9) we know that there exist nonzero elements $u_1 \in Stab(a_{t_0} q_1) \cap \mathfrak{n}_-$ and $u_2 \in Stab(a_{t_0} q_2) \cap \mathfrak{n}_-$ such that

$$\mathrm{Ad}(a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}) u_1 = u_2$$

and hence

$$\mathrm{Ad}(a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0}) \mathfrak{n}_- \cap \mathfrak{n}_- \neq \{0\}.$$

So by Proposition 4.1, we have $a_{t_0} n a_{-t_0} = e$, $n = e$ and $q_1 = q_2$. This completes the proof of the proposition. ∎

Proof of Theorem 3.1 in the case of $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$. By Proposition 6.3, we can construct an open cover of $S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma)$

$$\begin{aligned} S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) &= S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \cap \bigcup_q \bigcup_C \{B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q\} \\ &= \bigcup_C \left(S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \cap \bigcup_q \{B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where q runs through all rational points in $U_0(e\Gamma)$ and C runs through all the positive rational numbers. To get an upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of $S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma)$, it suffices to get an upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of

$$S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \cap \bigcup_q \{B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q\}$$

for each $C \in \mathbb{Q}_+$. Fix $C > 0$ and let $\delta > 0$. By Proposition 5.6, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_q \operatorname{diam}^\delta (B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q) \\ = & \sum_q (Cd(q))^{-\delta\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}} \\ \sim & \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{2^n \le d(q) \le 2^{n+1}} d(q)^{-\delta\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}} \\ \sim & \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (2^n)^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} (2^n)^{-\delta\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}} \\ = & \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (2^n)^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha - \delta\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the Hausdorff dimension of

$$S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \cap \bigcup_q \{B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\gamma}})q\}$$

is less than or equal to $\frac{\alpha-\gamma}{\alpha} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ for each $C \in \mathbb{Q}_+$, and hence

$$\dim S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \le \frac{\alpha-\gamma}{\alpha} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

For the lower bound, we fix a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and construct a tree-like set in $U_0(e\Gamma)$ by induction. Let $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{U_0(e\Gamma)\}$ and $\mathbf{A}_0 = U_0(e\Gamma)$. Let r_0 be as in Proposition 7.1 and pick a sufficiently large number l_1. Define

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \left\{ B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q \middle| q \in S(U, l_1/2, l_1) \right\}$$

and $\mathbf{A}_1 = \bigcup \mathcal{A}_1$. Suppose that we find $l_1 < l_2 < \cdots < l_j$ and construct families $\mathcal{A}_j, \mathcal{A}_{j-1}, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_0$ and subsets $\mathbf{A}_j \subseteq \mathbf{A}_{j-1} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathbf{A}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{A}_0$. Now by Proposition 7.1, we can find a sufficiently large $l_{j+1} > 0$ such that

1. $\log l_{j+1} \geq j^2 \log(l_j l_{j-1} \ldots l_1)$.
2. For every $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q \in \mathcal{A}_j$, it contains at least

$$C_0 l_{j+1}^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} \mu_{N_+}(B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q)$$

sub-open boxes of the form $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(\tilde{q})^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})\tilde{q}$ with

$$\tilde{q} \in S(B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q, l_{j+1}/2, l_{j+1}).$$

We denote the family of all these new sub-open boxes by $\mathcal{A}_{j+1}$ as $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q$ runs through all the open boxes in $\mathcal{A}_j$ and let $\mathbf{A}_{j+1} = \bigcup \mathcal{A}_{j+1}$.

Now we take $\mathbf{A}_\infty = \bigcap_{j=0}^\infty \mathbf{A}_j$ and $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{j=0}^\infty \mathcal{A}_j$. By the construction of $\mathbf{A}_j$'s and Proposition 6.4, we know that $\mathbf{A}_\infty \subset S_\gamma^c$. Also we have that

$$\Delta_j(\mathcal{A}) \sim l_{j+1}^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} l_{j+1}^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} \text{ and } d_j(\mathcal{A}) = r_0 l_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}.$$

By Theorem 2.1, we know that

$$\dim_H(\mathbf{A}_\infty) \geq \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha - \limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^j \log\left(\frac{1}{l_{i+1}^{-\frac{\gamma+\epsilon}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha}}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{l_{j+1}^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}}\right)} = \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \left(1 - \frac{\gamma+\epsilon}{\alpha}\right).$$

Let $\epsilon \to 0$ and we have

$$\dim_H S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \geq \frac{\alpha-\gamma}{\alpha} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem if $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1 in the case of $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq 0$. By Proposition 6.7, we can construct an open cover of $S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma)$

$$\begin{aligned} S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) &= S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \cap \bigcup_C \bigcup_q \{B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, Cd(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q\} \\ &= \bigcup_C \left(S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \cap \bigcup_q \{B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, Cd(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where q runs through all rational points in $U_0(e\Gamma)$ and C runs through all the positive rational numbers. To get an upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of $S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma)$, it suffices to get an upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of

$$S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \cap \bigcup_q \{B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, Cd(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q\}$$

for each $C \in \mathbb{Q}_+$. Fix $C \in \mathbb{Q}_+$. For each rational $q \in U_0(e\Gamma)$, we devide $B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, Cd(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q$ into small cubes of equal sides of length $Cd(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}$, and there are $(d(q)^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha}$ such small cubes. Let $\mathcal{F}_C$ be the collection of all these small cubes of equal sides of length $Cd(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}$ where q runs through all rational points in $U_0(e\Gamma)$. For any $\delta > 0$, by Proposition 7.2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{B \in \mathcal{F}_C} \operatorname{diam}(B)^\delta \\ \sim & \sum_q d(q)^{-\delta \frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}} (d(q)^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} \\ = & \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{2^n \leq d(q) \leq 2^{n+1}} d(q)^{-\delta \frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}} (d(q)^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} \\ \sim & \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (2^n)^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + 2\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}} (2^n)^{-\delta \frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}} ((2^n)^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} \\ = & \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (2^n)^{\frac{4\alpha-\gamma}{2\alpha-\gamma} \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + 2\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} - \delta \frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the Hausdorff dimension of

$$S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \cap \bigcup_q \{B_{N_+}(Cd(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}}, Cd(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-\gamma}})q\}$$

is less than or equal to $\frac{4\alpha-\gamma}{4\alpha}\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha + \frac{2\alpha-\gamma}{2\alpha}\dim\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}$ for each $C \in \mathbb{Q}_+$, and hence

$$\dim S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \leq \frac{4\alpha-\gamma}{4\alpha}\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha + \frac{2\alpha-\gamma}{2\alpha}\dim\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}.$$

For the lower bound, we fix a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and construct a tree-like set in U_0 by induction. Let $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{U_0(e\Gamma)\}$ and $\mathbf{A}_0 = U_0(e\Gamma)$. Let r_0 be as in Proposition 7.2 and pick a sufficiently large number l_1. Define

$$\mathcal{A}_1' = \left\{ B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}, r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q \middle| q \in S(U_0(e\Gamma), l_1/2, l_1) \right\}.$$

For each $q \in S(U_0(e\Gamma), l_1/2, l_1)$, we devide $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}, r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})q$ in $\mathcal{A}_1'$ into small cubes of equal sides of length $r_0 d(q)^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_1$ be the family of all these small cubes and $\mathbf{A}_1 = \bigcup \mathcal{A}_1$. Suppose that we find $l_1 < l_2 < \cdots < l_j$ and construct families $\mathcal{A}_j, \mathcal{A}_{j-1}, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_0$ and subsets $\mathbf{A}_j \subseteq \mathbf{A}_{j-1} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathbf{A}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{A}_0$. Now by Proposition 7.2, we can find a sufficiently large $l_{j+1} > 0$ such that

1. $\log l_{j+1} \geq j^2 \log(l_j l_{j-1} \ldots l_1)$.
2. For every $B \in \mathcal{A}_j$, it contains at least

$$C_0 l_{j+1}^{\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha + 2\dim\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}} \mu_{N_+}(B)$$

sub-open boxes of the form $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(\tilde{q})^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}, r_0 d(\tilde{q})^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})\tilde{q}$ with

$$\tilde{q} \in S(B, l_{j+1}/2, l_{j+1}).$$

For each $\tilde{q} \in S(B, l_{j+1}/2, l_{j+1})$, we devide $B_{N_+}(r_0 d(\tilde{q})^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}, r_0 d(\tilde{q})^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}})\tilde{q}$ into small cubes of equal sides of length $r_0 d(\tilde{q})^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}$. We denote the family of all these small cubes by $\mathcal{A}_{j+1}$ as B runs through all the cubes in $\mathcal{A}_j$ and let $\mathbf{A}_{j+1} = \bigcup \mathcal{A}_{j+1}$.

Now we take $\mathbf{A}_\infty = \bigcap_{j=0}^\infty \mathbf{A}_j$ and $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{j=0}^\infty \mathcal{A}_j$. By the construction of $\mathbf{A}_j$'s and Proposition 6.8, we know that $\mathbf{A}_\infty \subset S_\gamma^c$. Also we have that

$$\Delta_j(\mathcal{A}) \sim l_{j+1}^{\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha + 2\dim\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}} l_{j+1}^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}\dim\mathfrak{g}_\alpha} l_{j+1}^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}\dim\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}} \text{ and } d_j(\mathcal{A}) = r_0 l_j^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}.$$

By Theorem 2.1, we know that

$$\dim_H S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \geq \dim_H(\mathbf{A}_\infty)$$

$$\geq \dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + \dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} - \limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{j} \log\left(l_{i+1}^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha + 2\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}} l_{i+1}^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} l_{i+1}^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha}} \right)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{l_{j+1}^{-\frac{4\alpha}{2\alpha-(\gamma+\epsilon)}}} \right)}$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{\gamma+\epsilon}{2\alpha}\right)\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} + \left(1 - \frac{\gamma+\epsilon}{4\alpha}\right)\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

Let $\epsilon \to 0$ and we have

$$\dim_H S_\gamma^c \cap U_0(e\Gamma) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{2\alpha}\right)\dim \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} + \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{4\alpha}\right)\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

8 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.2. Let

$$S(i,\gamma) = \{p \in G/\Gamma | \exists C > 0 \text{ s.t. } \eta(a_t p)\chi_{Y_i}(a_t p) \geq Ce^{-\gamma t}\chi_{Y_i}(a_t p)\ (\forall t > 0)\}.$$

Then by definition, we know that

$$S_{\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_k} = S(1,\gamma_1) \cap \cdots \cap S(k,\gamma_k)$$

and hence

$$\dim_H S^c_{\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_k} = \max_{1\leq i\leq k} \dim_H S(i,\gamma_i)^c.$$

So in order to prove Theorem 1.2, it is enough to prove the following

Theorem 8.1. *Let $i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$. If $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$, then the Hausdorff dimension of $S(i,\gamma)^c$ $(0 \leq \gamma < \alpha)$ is*

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_0 + \frac{\alpha-\gamma}{\alpha}\dim g_\alpha.$$

If $g_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$, then the Hausdorff dimension of $S(i,\gamma)^c$ $(0 \leq \gamma < 2\alpha)$ is

$$\dim \mathfrak{g}_{-2\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_0 + \frac{4\alpha-\gamma}{4\alpha}\dim g_\alpha + \frac{2\alpha-\gamma}{2\alpha}\dim g_{2\alpha}.$$

Now we will fix a cusp ξ_i for some $i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$ and let $\sigma_i \in \Sigma$ be the element corresponding to ξ_i.

Proof of Theorem 8.1. The proof for $S(i,\gamma)^c$ is almost identical to the proof of Theorem 1.1 (or equivalently Theorem 3.1), except that we replace rational points by σ_i-rational points, denominators by σ_i-denominators. In fact, our discussion in section 5 is cuspwise, and we can use Proposition 5.3 and Proposition 5.4 to count σ_i-rational points instead of Proposition 5.6. Hence Proposition 7.1 and Proposition 7.2 holds also for σ_i-rational points with σ_i-denominators. The same happens in Proposition 6.4 and Proposition 6.8. The only thing we need to do is to prove that after replacing by σ_i-rational points and σ_i-denominators in Proposition 6.2 and Proposition 6.6 with the assumption that $p \in S(i,\gamma)^c$, the rational $q \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ we obtain is actually a σ_i-rational point. We will prove this for the case of $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$. The case of $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} \neq \emptyset$ is similar.

Now assume that $\mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha} = \emptyset$ and $p \in S(i,\gamma)^c$. By the proof of Proposition 6.2, we know that the rational point $q \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ satisfies the condition that

$$na_{t_0}p = a_{t_0}q$$

for some bounded $n \in N_+$, and we have $a_{t_0}p \in Y_i$. This implies that

$$\eta(a_{t_0}q) \sim \eta(a_{t_0}p) \sim C_p e^{-\gamma t_0}$$

and the rational point $a_{t_0}q \in Y_i'$ for a small neighborhood Y_i' of ξ_i in G/Γ. This happens if and only if $q \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ is a σ_i-rational point. This completes the proof of Theorem 8.1. □

9 Diophantine Approximation in Heisenberg Groups

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.3 about Diophantine approximation in Heisenberg groups. We will follow the notations and results in [HP02B].

Let

$$Q = -(z_0\overline{z_1} + z_1\overline{z_0}) + z_2\overline{z_2} + \cdots + z_n\overline{z_n}$$

which is a hermitian form defined on $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. Let $G \cong SU(n,1)$ be the group preserving Q and $\Gamma = G(\mathbb{Z}[i])$. Let $\mathcal{M} = K\backslash G/\Gamma \cong \mathbf{H}^n_{\mathbb{C}}/\Gamma$ where K is the maximal compact subgroup of G. Here we will use the model of Siegel domain for $\mathbb{H}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$ (see section 3.8 in [HP02B]). Note that $\mathcal{M}$ is not of constant curvature. Let $\{a_t\}$ be the geodesic flow on G/Γ. For simplicity, we will

assume that $\mathcal{M}$ has only one cusp $\xi = \infty$; for general case, we only need to replace rational points by σ-rational points in the following arguments as we do in section 8 and then apply Theorem 8.1. We know that Γ acts naturally on $\partial\mathbb{H}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$ and will denote by Γ_∞ the stabilizer of $\xi = \infty$ in Γ.

In this setting we have that the orbit $\{a_t(e\Gamma)\}$ diverges to the cusp $\xi = \infty$ in $\partial\mathbb{H}^n_{\mathbb{C}}$ as $t \to \pm\infty$ since $\Gamma \cap N_- \neq \{e\}$ and $\Gamma \cap N_+ \neq \{e\}$. Also the $\{a_t\}$-expanding horospherical subgroup $N_+ \cong \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ acts naturally on $\partial\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{C}^n}$ (see section 3.10 in [HP02B]). We will denote by π_K the projection from G/Γ to $\mathcal{M}$ and by π_M the projection from G/Γ to $M\backslash G/\Gamma$. Let $x_0 = \pi_K(e\Gamma)$ and $U_0 \subset N_+$ be a small open subset. The simple root $\alpha = 1$. We will write

$$B_{\mathrm{Cyg}}(\alpha, R) = \{\beta \in H_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R}) : d_{\mathrm{Cyg}}(\beta, \alpha) < R\}.$$

We recall some definitions and notations from [HP02B]. The geodesic lines starting from $\xi = \infty$ and diverging to itself in $\mathcal{M}$ are called rational lines, and the geodesic lines starting from $\xi = \infty$ but not diverging to it are called irrational lines. By section 3.10 in [HP02B], we can identify the geodesic lines in $\mathcal{M}$ starting from $\xi = \infty$ with $(\partial\mathbf{H}^n_{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \{\infty\})/\Gamma_\infty \cong \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})/\Gamma_\infty$, and identify the rational lines starting from $\xi = \infty$ with rational points in a subset of $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$. The height function β on $\mathcal{M}$, the Hamenstädt distance d_∞ on $\partial\mathbf{H}^n_{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R}) \cup \{\infty\}$ and the depth $D(r)$ of a rational geodesic line r in $\mathcal{M}$ are all defined in section 2 in [HP02B]. For simplicity, we will not list these concepts here. Readers may refer to [HP02B] for more details. Note that by Proposition 3.14 in [HP02B], for a geodesic line r, we have

$$D(r) = \ln h(r) \text{ and } d_\infty = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} d_{\mathrm{Cyg}}$$

where r is identified with a point in $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$ and $h(r)$ is the height of $r \in \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$ as defined in the introduction (see Definition 1.4).

Also note that $\pi_K(a_t(e\Gamma))$ diverges to $\xi = \infty$ as $t \to -\infty$ and $U_0 \subset N_+$, we have that for any $p \in U_0(e\Gamma)$, $\pi_K(a_t p)$ also diverges to $\xi = \infty$ as $t \to -\infty$, and hence $\pi_K(a_t p)$ is a geodesic line starting from $\xi = \infty$ which could be identified with a point in the Heisenberg group $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ (or precisely, in the quotient space $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})/\Gamma_\infty$).

Proposition 9.1. *Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma)$. Then p is rational in the sense of Definition 5.1 if and only if the geodesic line $\pi_K(a_t p)$ in $\mathcal{M}$ is rational.*

Proof. Suppose that p is rational in the sense of Definition 5.1. Then by definition, $a_t p$ diverges in G/Γ to the cusp $\xi = \infty$ as $t \to \infty$ and hence so does $\pi_K(a_t p)$ in $\mathcal{M}$. Since $a_t p$ also diverges to the cusp as $t \to -\infty$. This implies that $\pi_K(a_t p)$ is a rational geodesic line in the sense of [HP02B].

Conversely, if $\pi_K(a_t p)$ is a rational geodesic line, then $a_t p$ diverges to the cusp as $t \to \infty$ and hence by Corollary 6.2 in [D85] and Proposition 5.1, we know that p is rational. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

This proposition implies that the rational points in $U_0(e\Gamma)$ in the sense of Definition 5.1 could be thought of as rational points in $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$ via the identification. Specifically, if $p = g\Gamma \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ is a rational point where $g \in U_0 \subset N_+ \cong \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{R})$, then g could be identified with a point in $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{Q})$. In the following, we will often use this identification for convenience.

Proposition 9.2. *Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ be rational with $p = g\Gamma$ for some $g \in U_0$. Then we have*

$$h(g) \sim d(p).$$

Here by the remark above, g is a point in $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$ via the identification and the implicit constant depends only on U_0 and G/Γ.

Proof. We will consider the rational line $\pi_K(\{a_t p\})$ and its depth $D(\pi_K(\{a_t p\}))$. Fix a level set $\beta^{-1}(l) \subset \mathcal{M}$ for some l. Then there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any $p' \in \pi_K^{-1}(\beta^{-1}(l))$ we have

$$\eta(p') \sim \epsilon.$$

Let $s_0 > 0$ be the last time such that $a_{s_0} p \in \pi_K^{-1}(\beta^{-1}(l))$. Then by definition, we have

$$\epsilon \sim \eta(a_{s_0} p) \sim e^{-2s_0} d(p)^2. \tag{10}$$

On the other hand, since $a_t(e\Gamma)$ diverges as $t \to -\infty$, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that t_0 is the largest number with $a_{-t_0}(e\Gamma) \in \pi_K^{-1}(\beta^{-1}(l))$ and we have

$$\epsilon \sim \eta(a_{-t_0}(e\Gamma)) \sim e^{2t_0}. \tag{11}$$

As $p \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ and a_{-t} contracts N_+ as $t \to \infty$, $a_{-t_0} p$ is near the subset $\pi_K^{-1}(\beta^{-1}(l))$. By definition of the depth function, this implies that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$|D(\pi_K(\{a_t p\})) - (s_0 + t_0)| \leq C_1.$$

Also by equations (10) and (11), we know that

$$d(p)^2 \sim e^{2(s_0+t_0)}.$$

So there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$d(p) \sim e^{D(\pi_K(\{a_t p\}))}.$$

This implies that

$$d(p) \sim h(g).$$

Note that the implicit constant depends only on U_0 and G/Γ. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Proposition 9.3. *Let $p \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ with $p = g\Gamma$ for some $g \in U_0$ and let $\epsilon > 0$ be a sufficiently small number. If there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence $q_j \in U_0(e\Gamma)$ of distinct rational points with $d(q_j) \to \infty$ such that*

$$p \in B_{N_+}(Cd(q_j)^{-(\gamma+\epsilon)}, Cd(q_j)^{-2(\gamma+\epsilon)})q_j,$$

then $g \in N_+ \cong \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$ is not Diophantine of type γ in the Heisenberg group $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. By the definition of the Cygan distance, the remark in Proposition 9.1 and Proposition 9.2, the condition in the proposition is equivalent to the condition that there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence of points $r_j \in U_0 \subset N_+$, which could be identified with rational points in $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$ with $h(r_j) \to \infty$, such that

$$d_{Cyg}(g, r_j) \leq \frac{C}{h(r_j)^{\gamma+\epsilon}}.$$

By definition, this implies that g is not Diophantine of type γ. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The proof is similar to that in Theorem 1.1. For the upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension of L^c_γ, it is enough to get an upper bound for $L^c_\gamma \cap U_0$ for every small open subset U_0 in $N_+ \cong \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})$. Now fix a small open subset U_0. By definition, we can construct an open cover of $L^c_\gamma \cap U_0$ as follows

$$L^c_\gamma \cap U_0 \;=\; \left(\bigcup_r \bigcup_C B_{Cyg}(r, Ch^{-\gamma}(r)) \right) \cap L^c_\gamma \cap U_0$$

$$= \bigcup_C \left(\bigcup_r B_{Cyg}(r, Ch^{-\gamma}(r)) \right) \cap L_\gamma^c \cap U_0.$$

where C runs through all the positive rational numbers and r runs through all the rational points in $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$. So it is enough to get an upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of

$$\left(\bigcup_r B_{Cyg}(r, Ch^{-\gamma}(r)) \right) \cap L_\gamma^c \cap U_0.$$

For each rational r, the $B_{Cyg}(r, Ch^{-\gamma}(r))$ could be thought of as a box with lengths $Ch^{-\gamma}(r)$ in the first $2(n-1)$ real coordinates (or the first $n-1$ complex coordinates) and length $C^2h^{-2\gamma}(r)$ in the last coordinate, with respect to the right invariant distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{R})}$. So we can devide $B_{Cyg}(r, Ch^{-\gamma}(r))$ into small cubes of equal sides of length $C^2h^{-2\gamma}(r)$, and there are $(h(r)^\gamma/C)^{2n-2}$ such small cubes. Let $\mathcal{F}_C$ be the collection of all these small cubes of equal sides of length

$$C^2h(r)^{-2\gamma}$$

where r runs through all rational points in $\mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})$.

Fix $C > 0$ and let $\delta > 0$. By Theorem 3.7 in [HP02B], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{B \in \mathcal{F}_C} \operatorname{diam}^\delta(B) \\
\sim & \sum_{r \in \mathcal{H}_{2n-1}(\mathbb{Q})} h(r)^{-2\delta\gamma} h(r)^{\gamma(2n-2)} \\
= & \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{2^{j-1} \le h(r) \le 2^j} h(r)^{-2\delta\gamma} h(r)^{\gamma(2n-2)} \\
\ll & \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{2nj} 2^{-2j\delta\gamma} 2^{j\gamma(2n-2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\dim_H L_\gamma^c \le \frac{1+\gamma}{\gamma} n - 1.$$

For the lower bound of the Hausdorff dimension, by Proposition 9.3, we only need to repeat the proof in Theorem 1.1, and we can get

$$\dim_H L_\gamma^c \cap U_0 \ge \frac{1+\gamma+\epsilon}{2(\gamma+\epsilon)} 2(n-1) + \frac{1}{\gamma+\epsilon}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\epsilon \to 0$ and we have

$$\dim_H L^c_\gamma \geq \frac{1+\gamma}{\gamma}(n-1) + \frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

10 Further Discussions

10.1 The Hyperbolic Case

In this subsection, we will discuss the relation between the definition of Diophantine points in this paper and the work by Melián and Pestana [MP93] where they deal with the hyperbolic case. We will assume $G = SO(d+1,1)$. First, we need some notations in [MP93]. Let $\mathcal{M}^{d+1} = \mathbf{H}^{d+1}/\Gamma$ be a complete non-compact Riemannian manifold of constant negative curvature and of finite volume, where Γ is a non-uniform lattice in G. Denote by $d_{\mathbf{H}^{d+1}}$ the distance on $\mathcal{M}^{d+1}$. For any point $x \in \mathcal{M}^{d+1}$, let $S(x)$ be the unit ball in the tangent space of $\mathcal{M}^{d+1}$ at x. Let $g_v(t)$ be the geodesic starting from x in the direction of $v \in S(x)$. For any $\gamma \geq 0$, we write

$$E_\gamma(x) = \left\{ v \in S(x) : \limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{d_{\mathbf{H}^{d+1}}(g_v(t), x)}{t} \geq \gamma \right\}.$$

Note that the maximal compact subgroup $K \cong SO(d+1)$, $M \cong SO(d)$ and $\{a_t\}$ is the geodesic flow on G/Γ. Note that here the simple root $\alpha = 1$. We will denote by π_K the projection from G/Γ to $\mathcal{M}^{d+1} = K\backslash G/\Gamma$ and π_M the projection from G/Γ to $T^1\mathcal{M}^{d+1} = M\backslash G/\Gamma$. Let $x_0 = \pi_K(e\Gamma) \in \mathcal{M}^{d+1}$.

Proposition 10.1. *For any $p \in G/\Gamma$ we have*

$$\eta(p) \sim e^{-d_{\mathbf{H}^{d+1}}(\pi_K(p), x_0)}.$$

Here the implicit constant depends only on G and Γ.

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, for any $p \in G/\Gamma$, we can write

$$p = k a_{t_0} n \sigma \Gamma$$

for some $k \in K = SO(n)$, $a_{t_0} \in A$ with $t_0 \geq s_0$, $n \in N_-(V_0)$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$. On the one hand, since A contracts N_- and k, n, σ are all in compact subsets of G, by calculations, we have

$$\eta(p) \sim e^{-\alpha t_0} = e^{-t_0}.$$

On the other hand, since k, n, σ are all in compact subsets of G, by calculations, we have

$$|d_{\mathbf{H}^{d+1}}(\pi_K(p), x_0) - t_0| \leq C$$

for some constant $C > 0$. This implies that

$$\eta(p) \sim e^{-d_{\mathbf{H}^{d+1}}(\pi_K(p), x_0)}.$$

Note that all the implicit constants here depend only on G and Γ according to Theorem 2.2. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Remark 10.1. Note that we can prove a similar version for any semisimple Lie group of rank one.

Proposition 10.2. *Fix $x = \pi_K(p)$ with $p \in G/\Gamma$ and $x \in \mathcal{M}^{d+1}$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\pi_M(Kp \cap S^c_\gamma) \subset \{(x, v) : v \in E_\gamma(x)\} \subset \pi_M(Kp \cap S^c_{\gamma-\epsilon}).$$

Proof. Let $p' \in Kp \cap S^c_\gamma$. Let $\pi_M(p') = (x, v')$ for $v' \in T^1_x\mathcal{M}^{d+1}$. By definition, there exist a constant $C_1 > 0$ and a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ such that

$$\eta(a_{t_n} p') \leq Ce^{-\gamma t_n}.$$

By Proposition 10.1, this implies that

$$d_{\mathbf{H}^{d+1}}(g_{v'}(t_n), x_0) \geq \gamma t_n + C_2$$

for $t_n \to \infty$ and some constant C_2 and hence $v' \in E_\gamma(x)$. This proves the first inclusion.

Now we prove the second inclusion. Let $v \in E_\gamma(x)$. Let $p' \in G/\Gamma$ with $\pi_M(p') = (x, v)$. Then $p' \in Kp$. Since $v \in E_\gamma(x)$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sequence $t_n \to \infty$ such that

$$d_{\mathbf{H}^{d+1}}(g_v(t_n), x) \geq \left(\gamma - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) t_n$$

and hence there exists a constant C_3 such that

$$d_{\mathbf{H}^{d+1}}(g_v(t_n), x_0) \geq \left(\gamma - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) t_n + C_3.$$

By Proposition 10.1, there exists a constant $C_4 > 0$ such that

$$\eta(a_t p') \leq C_4 e^{-(\gamma - \frac{\epsilon}{2})t_n} = (Ce^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}t_n})e^{-(\gamma-\epsilon)t_n}.$$

Therefore $p' \in S^c_{\gamma-\epsilon}$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Now we show that in the case of hyperbolic spaces, our theorem coincides with Theorem 1 in [MP93].

Theorem 10.1 (Theorem 1 in [MP93])**.**

$$\dim_H E_\gamma(x) = (1-\gamma)d.$$

Proof. Let $x = \pi_K(p_0) \in \mathcal{M}^{d+1}$ for some $p_0 \in G/\Gamma$. By the discussions in section 3 and Theorem 3.1, we know that for any $p \in G/\Gamma$ and any small neighborhood W of e in G

$$\dim_H((Wp) \cap S^c_\gamma) = \dim \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_0 + (1-\gamma)\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

Now let W_K be a neighborhood of e in K and W_{AN_-} a neighborhood of e in AN_-. Then $W_{AN_-}W_K$ is a neighborhood of e in G, and hence

$$\dim_H((W_{AN_-}W_K p) \cap S^c_\gamma) = \dim \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} + \dim \mathfrak{g}_0 + (1-\gamma)\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

Since $\{a_t\}$ commutes with A and contracts N_-, by definition, a point $(hk)p$ with $h \in W_{AN_-}$ and $k \in W_K$ belongs to S_γ if and only if kp belongs to S_γ. Therefore we have

$$(W_{AN_-}W_K p) \cap S^c_\gamma = W_{AN_-}\left((W_K p) \cap S^c_\gamma\right).$$

This implies that

$$\dim_H(W_K p \cap S^c_\gamma) = \dim M + (1-\gamma)\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

Let p vary in the K-orbit Kp_0, we get

$$\dim_H(Kp_0 \cap S^c_\gamma) = \dim M + (1-\gamma)\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$$

and by Proposition 10.2, we have

$$\dim_H E_\gamma(x) = (1-\gamma)\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha = (1-\gamma)d.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1 in [MP93]. □

10.2 The Case of $G = PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$

In this subsection, we discuss the relation between Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 7.1 in [Z16]. We will assume that $G = PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ and Γ is a non-uniform lattice in G. Let $\{a_t\}$ be the geodesic flow on G/Γ and the simple root $\alpha = 1$. We will reuse the notations in the previous subsection. Now we can show that Definition 1.3 in this paper and definition 1.1 in [Z16] are equivalent in the following way:

By Proposition 10.1, we know that $p \in G/\Gamma$ is Diophantine of type $(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k)$ if and only if for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ we have

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \left(d_{\mathbf{H}^2}(\pi_K(a_t p), x_0) - \gamma_i t\right) \chi_{Y_i}(a_t p) < \infty$$

or equivalently (by simple logical deductions)

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \left(d_{\mathbf{H}^2}(\pi_K(a_t p), x_0)\chi_{Y_i}(a_t p) - \gamma_i t\right) < \infty.$$

By Lemma 3.4 in [Z16], this implies that p is Diophantine of type $(\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_k)$ in the sense of Definition 1.1 in [Z16] where

$$\kappa_i = \frac{1 + \gamma_i}{1 - \gamma_i}.$$

This also shows that Theorem 1.2 generalizes Theorem 7.1 in [Z16].

References

[GR70] H.Garland and M.S.Raghunathan, *Fundamental domains for lattices in $\mathbb{R}$-rank 1 semisimple Lie groups*, Ann. of Math., 92(2), 279-326,1970

[R72] M.S.Raghunathan, *Discrete subgroups of Lie groups*, Springer-Verlag, 1972

[D84] S. G. Dani, *On orbits of unipotent flows on homogeneous spaces*, Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys., 4, 25-34, 1984

[D85] S.G.Dani, *Divergent trajectories of flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation*, J.Reine. Angew. Math, 359, 55-89, 1985

[D86] S.G.Dani, *Bounded orbits of flows on homogeneous spaces*, Comment. Math. Helv. 61, 636-660, 1986

[M87] C. McMullen, *Area and Hausdorff dimension of Julia sets of entire functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 300, 329-342, 1987

[U91] M. Urbanski, *The Hausdorff dimension of the set of points with non-dense orbit under a hyperbolic dynamical system*, Nonlinearity 2, 385-397, 1991

[D92] M.M.Dodson, *Hausdorff dimension, lower order and Khintchine's theorem in metric Diophantine approximation*, J. reine angew. Math. 432, 69-76, 1992

[MP93] M.V.Melián and D.Pestana, *Geodesic excursions into cusps in finite-volume hyperbolic manifolds*, Michigan Math. J., 40, 77-93, 1993

[KM96] D.Y.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, *Bounded orbits of nonquasiunipotent flows on homogeneous spaces*, Sinai's Moscow Seminar on Dynamical Systems, 141-172, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2,171, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996

[KM99] D.Y.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, *Logarithm laws for flows on homogeneous spaces*, Invent. Math., 138(3), 451-494, 1999

[G99] W.M.Goldman, *Complex hyperbolic geometry*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1999

[K01] D.Y.Kleinbock, *Some applications of homogeneous dynamics to number theory*, in Smooth ergodic theory and its application, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 69, AMS, Providence, RI, 639-660, 2001

[HP01] S. Hersonsky and F. Paulin, *Hausdorff dimension of diophantine geodesics in negatively curved manifolds*, J. reine angew. Math. 539, 29-43, 2001

[K02] A.W.Knapp, *Lie groups beyond an introduction*, second edition, Progress in mathematics 140, Birkhauser, 2002

[HP02A] S. Hersonsky and F. Paulin, *Diophantine approximation for negatiely curved manifolds*, Math. Z. 241, 181-226, 2002

[HP02B] S. Hersonsky and F. Paulin, *Diophantine approximation in negatively curved manifolds and in the Heisenberg group*, Rigidity in Dynamics and Geometry (Cambridge, 2000), Eds. M. Burger and A. Iozzi. Springer, Berlin, 203-226, 2002

[HP04] S. Hersonsky and F. Paulin, *Counting orbit points in coverings of negatively curved manifolds and Hausdorff dimension of cusp excursions*, Ergod. Th and Dynam. Sys., 24, 803-824, 2004

[DE14] M.Dodson and B. Everitt, *Metrical Diophantine approximation for quaternions*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., 157, 513-542, 2014

[BZ16] C.D.Buenger and C.Zheng, *Non-Divergence of Unipotent Flows on Quotients of Rank One Semisimple Groups*, to appear in Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys., 2016

[Z16] C.Zheng, *Spare equidistribution of unipotent orbits in finite-volume homogeneous spaces*, to appear in J. Mod. Dyn., 2016